

SPECIAL MEETING

July 17, 2008

The Board of Public Works & Safety met in Special Session at 6:00 p.m. on the above date in the Meeting Room at City Hall Annex with Mayor Tucker presiding and member Askren and Higgins attending. Others attending were Supt. Givens; Danny Moss; Vicki Bethel; Judy Dicus Thomann, Len Ashak, Doug Ralston, Jim Williams – Bernardin Lochmueller & Associates; and Dave and Judy Whitten.

Mayor Tucker called the Special Meeting to order by stating the meeting was called to get public feedback on the LTCP and the financing that will also be required. With that, he then turned the meeting over to Mr. Ashak for his presentation.

Mr. Ashak stated the city's Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) was submitted to IDEM in May 2007, as a result of the Clean Water Act in reference to CSO's and SSO's, and the city's Agreed Order due to the Sawmill CSO. He added the LTCP was then approved in late 2007; and a Judicial Order was filed with the county court in July 2007, a civil action. He presented the following:

REVISION TO LTCP/PER

LTCP/PER Submitted May 2007

Revision done in response to IDEM's comments

Used as much of the prior LTCP in order to eliminate any unnecessary duplication

Critical elements revised in the Revised LTCP/PER include:

Modeling;

Alternative Evaluation

Chosen Alternative.

Mr. Ashak continued his presentation by presenting the following CSO Treatment Alternatives that the city had to choose from to be in compliance:

1. 1. Sawmill Sewer Separation and Convey Flow from Canal Street, Water Street, Mill Street, and Vine Street to WWTP
=Full Treatment: 1 Yr/1 Hr Flow and Primary Treatment With Disinfection: 10 Yr/1 Hr Minus 1 Yr/1Hr Flow
(Note: Previously chose alternative)
2. 2. Sawmill Sewer Separation and Convey Flow from Canal Street, Water Street, Mill Street, and Vine Street to WWTP
=Full Treatment: 10 Yr/1 Hr Flow
3. 3. Convey Flow from all areas to WWTP
=Full Treatment: 1 Yr/1 Hr Flow and Primary Treatment With Disinfection: 10 Yr/1 Hr Minus 1 Yr/1 Hr Flow
4. 4. Convey Flow from all areas to WWTP
=Full Treatment: 10 Yr/1 Hr Flow

Mr. Ashak continued by then presenting the costs involved with each alternative. Alternative One - \$17.7M (recommend Alt. in the Previous LTCP); Alternative Two - \$17.9M; Alternative Three - \$15.2M; Alternative Four - \$13.8M (recommended Alt. in the Current LTCP). He then stated Alt. Four that the city has chosen, has economic as well as environmental benefits, as well as it saves the city around \$4M.

Selected Alternative 4: Economic and Environmental Benefits

1. 1. Most cost effective
2. 2. Provides for Elimination of Sawmill Overflow (at a lower Capital Cost)
3. 3. Provides Full Treatment to the 10 Yr/1 Hr Flow (2.2 inches of rain) Better Treatment than IDEM's Treatment Facility Requirements
4. 4. Enhances the use of the existing WWTP excess capacity
5. 5. Wet Weather Treatment upgrades by using existing equipment – reducing maintenance and providing a more Operator-friendly facility

Mr. Ashak added by doing the project in two phases makes the stipulated agreement go away (the judicial action), which will be in place until 2017. He then presented a breakdown of the two phases of the project, along with the cost breakdown.

I.	I.	Sawmill Elimination	
		Transport Sawmill CSO to Mill Creek Site	\$1,358,000
		Manhole Rehab Work – Priority I Only	135,000
		Mobilization/Demobilization	150,000
		Phase I Construction Cost (10% contingency)	1,808,000
		Phase I Project Cost (inc. non-construction cost)	\$2,157,000
II.	II.	Mill Creek Pump Station Upgrade and WWTP Improvements	
		New Mill Creek Pump Station/New Force Main to WWTP	\$2,809,000
		WWTP Improvements Including New Storage Basin	5,675,000
		Phase II Construction Cost (10% contingency)	9,333,000
		Phase II Project Cost (inc. non-construction cost)	\$11,128,000
		Total Project Construction Cost	\$11,141,000
		Total Project Non-Construction Cost	2,144,000
		TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$13,285,000

Mr. Ashak then stated the city has chosen to go through SRF for the financing of the project, a 20 year loan with a lower interest rate, which will also save the city money. He added Mayor Tucker has the application for that. He reminded the Board that all money for the project needs to be borrowed by 2013 and again, they have 20 years to pay that back. He asked if there were any questions ?

Board member Higgins stated in the past, Supt. Givens has made mention, as did Mr. Ashak, about there being two parts to the plant ?

Mr. Ashak replied they will be getting rid of the old primary tanks and reuse them for another purpose. The way the plant is set up now, valves need to be manually opened and that is not user-friendly, the upgrade will take care of that. He added by December 2013, the city will be done with their CSO's and will be off the radar screen of IDEM and the EPA.

The question was asked by Mayor Tucker about SSO's, specifically the SSO in E & S Housing Addition.

Mr. Ashak replied that will also be addressed. He added that has been an issue for the city as long as he has been around the city, the 1980's.

Mayor Tucker asked if anyone in the Audience had any questions or comments ?

Judy Whitten stated she lives on Water Street and was wondering the route of Sawmill to Mill Creek ?

Mr. Ashak replied it will be right next to the line that is already in the ground.

Mrs. Whitten stated she was told by someone that was spray painting the lines on the road that the new line would be moved across the street.

Mr. Ralston replied no, that is not happening. He added there will be one new line right down Water Street.

Mr. Ashak stated the new line, along side the old line, will be able to handle more storm water flow.

Dave Whitten asked how much all of this work is going to raise their sewer rates ?

Mayor Tucker stated that is a good question. He continued by stating when all of this first happened and he first sat down with BLA, he told them he wanted that judicial order gone and a plan signed off on by IDEM but that they also needed to save the city money, this plan does that.

Mr. Ashak added over the next five years, the average the bill could go up would be \$20 to \$25 per month, depending on the financing options, whichever is best for the city residents, but still gets the job done. He then asked if there were any other questions ?

There were none.

Mayor Tucker asked if there were any other questions or comments ?

There were none.

Mayor Tucker stated if there were no further business, he entertains a motion to adjourn.

Board member Askren moved the meeting be adjourned. Seconded by Board member Higgins.

Mayor Tucker stated all those in favor of the motion should signify in the affirmative; and following the vote, he reported the motion carried unanimously and adjourned the meeting.

John Tucker
Mayor

ATTEST:

Cristi L. Wolfe
Clerk-Treasurer